

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

December 4, 1998

Dear Beau,

Thanks for your letters of November 23 and 30.
I'll start with that of November 23.

Concerning the spellings "extravert" and "extrovert":
There are two Latin prefixes used in English,
intro and extra. Thus we have:

introduce

introspection

intromit

extraordinary

extradite

extraterritorial

extramarital

extravagant

etc.

(Intra is also used, but it is a different prefix with a different meaning. "Intro" means "inward", while "intra" means "within". Thus "introduce" means literally "to lead inward or into", while "intramural" means "within the walls".)

Introvert (turned inward) and extravert (turned outward) were originally (and, I claim, correctly) spelled with an o and an a respectively. However, because the two words were paired, there was confusion about where the o and the a were supposed to go, and consequently one encountered the misspellings intravert and extrovert so frequently that they eventually became accepted as alternative spellings. For some reason the spelling intravert seems to have died out and extrovert has become more common than extravert. The paperback dictionary that I have here in

the prison lists extrovert as the primary spelling and extravert as an alternative spelling.

If you like, you can replace extravert with extrovert. But I still maintain that extravert is the correct spelling and that extrovert is merely an error that has become popular.

*

Regarding the unverifiable information that I mentioned on p. 3 of my November 1 letter, and that you referred to in the last paragraph on p. 1 of your November 23 letter: That information came from Alston Chase, and since a couple of my correspondents have given me reason to doubt Chase's honesty, as I indicated in my letter of November 19, I think I can just disregard his information unless and until he can convince me that the doubts about his honesty are unfounded (as they may well be). I wrote to Chase on November 16 inviting him to defend himself against what my correspondents had said about him, but I haven't yet received his reply.

*

You referred to the "photographed example of petty vandalism on the birch tree." There are no birch trees in the neighborhood of Lincoln, Montana, unless conceivably a cultivated specimen in someone's yard. The tree ^{in the photo} is a quaking aspen. (At least, it's what everyone around Lincoln calls a quaking aspen. Possibly it might be some different but closely-related species of poplar — I never took the trouble to check out that species with

my tree book. But in any case it certainly is a poplar of some kind and not a birch.)

*

I'm enclosing the photograph of Baldy Mountain, or Old Baldy as the local people generally call it. This is a view looking in a southeasterly direction from a point along Stemple Pass Road. Stemple Pass Road is the brown streak in the foreground at the bottom. If we let the distance between the ruled lines on this sheet of paper be one unit, then Baldy Mountain is the peak about 5 units from the bottom of the photo and 4 units from the left edge of the photo. On the right-hand flank of the peak you'll see a snow-covered area that is bare of trees; this 'bald' spot gives the mountain its name. Notice the horizontal ridge that extends from Baldy toward the right. In front of it you'll see another ridge that slopes downward toward the right. My cabin was in the gulch between the two ridges.

This photo was taken by . . .

I'll bet she would be willing, for a modest fee, to take other photos of my property, of Baldy Mountain, or of nearby areas. If you're interested in having her do this, ~~that~~ feel free to contact her. She may be suspicious of you,

since she and some of the other people I know around Lincoln have been pestered by media people prying for information, so I'm enclosing a note you can send her to show her that you're alright.

The Federal Defenders Office in Sacramento is sending me a batch of photographs. As soon as I get them I'll select those that you might possibly find useful and send them to you. With the same understanding as before, namely, that you'll return to me the ones you don't want to use, and will return the others when you've finished with them.

*

The \$2255 filing date will probably be a few days before May 4, 1999, since it now seems pretty certain that May 4 is the deadline. Michael Mello tells me he has put you in contact with Professor Bonnie, and I suggest that you discuss the timing of publication with Bonnie.

*

Needless to say, I was very pleased by what you told me about David Korzenik and the copyright problem. I wrote to Professor Oliver Goodenough of Vermont Law School, a copyright attorney whom Michael Mello recommends as one of the best. He does seem to disagree on one important point with the information from Korzenik that you relayed to me. You wrote (in your letter of November 23, p.3):

"Copyright law most certainly does allow the use of personal letters to defend one's reputation." But Goodenough writes:

"[T]he legislative history speaks in terms of threats to reputation contained in the material to be reprinted. While the logic would seem to permit printing material from a different source to combat a derogatory statement, the history isn't clear on the point."

(Hmmm — Does my quotation of this passage from Goodenough's letter constitute fair use? Well, no matter; I understand that Vermont Law School emphasizes pro bono work, so if Goodenough sues me for copyright infringement I should be able to get him to defend me against himself pro bono.)

I mention the foregoing statement of Goodenough's merely for your information. If you want to rely on Korzenik, that's fine with me. You rather than I would be the one who would stand to lose in the event of a lawsuit. I haven't got any money to lose anyway.

It is possible that my brother would be willing to grant all rights to his letters, but if he knows what the book is about I don't think it is likely. He will be much more concerned to prevent me from discrediting him than to earn money for the alleged victims. He is trying to get money for the victims (so called) not from compassion but in order to win approval for himself.

*

You are right in saying that Mello and

Greenberg are excellent people. But, like most of us, they have their faults. Mello's fault — carelessness — is not so serious, at least as far as his book is concerned, since his errors can be corrected. I'm much more worried about Greenberg. He is just in too ~~damn~~ damned big of a hurry to start publishing about me and my case. He's so anxious that he reminds me of a man in a crowded restroom who has to go desperately and is trying to push his way to the front of the line because he just can't wait another moment. I'm afraid he may turn out to be a loose cannon, and if I didn't have such a high opinion of his intelligence and his ability as a writer, I would already have told him to go to hell.

By the way, I have now worked my way through most of Mello's manuscript. The remarks I made in my letter of November 19 were probably too harsh. I was appalled by evidence of carelessness that I found in the first part of the book, but the rest seems much better in that respect. However, I've found frequent errors in citations throughout the manuscript.

*

If you're interested in people with book manuscripts to offer, I can put you in touch with a couple. Both are already published authors (not, as far as I know, self-published or vanity-published). One is an environmental anarchist who has published various articles and at least one,

actually I think two, books. He complains that he's having difficulty finding a market for his recent work because he's becoming increasingly radical and his stuff is too hot to handle. I can well believe it, since he's the most fiery radical that I know. The other author is a man of a very different type. He seems to be gentle and contemplative. He's a Ph.D. who has published one book of psychological theory and is now seeking a publisher ~~about~~ for a philosophical work about his relationship with nature. If you're interested in seeing what either of these writers ~~have~~ ^{has} to offer, let me know, and I'll give them your name and address.

*

I'll put my thoughts about the contract in a separate letter, since I want to study the matter a bit.

*

You asked what I thought of the change of title of Mello's book. I think it's an improvement.

*

Now for your letter of November 30. I should bear in mind your remarks about the unreliability of second-hand information. I tend to take at face value any information that is relayed to me by an intelligent person — forgetting that even intelligent people often are sloppy about stating facts. For example, I should withhold my judgment about Alston Chase until I've heard what he has to say for himself.

*

I have not yet had an opportunity to discuss with Professor Bonnie the timing of publication. I have no objection to your discussing it with him directly. There isn't much I can tell you about what will happen with the \$2255 motion. At present Professor Bonnie is in charge of that.

*

You mention that Gary Greeberg understands your position as an ~~in~~ independent publisher. But I don't understand it. If you would care to tell me anything that would enlighten me, I'd be pleased to hear it.

*

Please don't send me any money. I have what I need for the present, and if too much were put on my account, the prison authorities might increase the rate at which I am expected to pay for fines and restitution. If I find myself in need of money for postage, etc., I'll let you know. But thank you for your offer.

*

I see no reason why your assistant should not work on my manuscript.

*

There is an individual named Chris Waits who lives near Lincoln, Montana who claims (falsely) to have been a friend of mine, and who (according to information I've received from independent sources) is publishing a book about me. Several of my neighbors at Lincoln will confirm that Waits is a liar. One of

my sources of information says that Waits's book is to appear in a couple of weeks, another says it's to appear in January. One source says the publisher is "Houghton Press", another says it's "Haughton". The prison librarian has searched for Houghton or Haughton Press for me and has been able to find no such company, so I assume that Houghton Mifflin is meant; though it seems a little surprising that a large and respectable publishing company would publish a book like Waits's without checking up on his reliability. Do you have contacts in the publishing world that would enable you to find out who is publishing this book?

*

Let me return for a moment to the copyright issue. In your earlier letters you wrote that copyright infringement was the "sticking point" that you foresaw and that your lawyer wanted to ask my brother for permission to use his letters. But in your letter of November 23, p.3, you seem to say that there's not much of a problem. Why the change? Was the lawyer you consulted earlier someone other than Korzenik?

Also, what about copyright problems with documents other than the family letters? With such documents though, I see no reason why there should be much difficulty about getting permission for publication. Still, I'd like to know what Korzenik says about them.

*

I think that covers everything I wanted to address in this letter. As I've already indicated, my comments on the contract will be put in a separate letter.

Best regards,

Ted Kaczynski